

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 10-20 are now in the application. Claims 10-20 are subject to examination. Claim 10 has been amended. Claim 20 has been added.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 10-19 have been rejected as being obvious over Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0043782 A1 to Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,987,770 to Yonge under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly provide antecedent basis for the first and second central control devices.

Claim 10 includes a step of: thereby operating the first central control device to control the transmission channels available to the first radio coverage area, both for transmitting data between the first central control device and the intermediate station and for transmitting data between the intermediate station and the second central control device.

Gupta does not teach such a step. In fact, Gupta teaches away from the step of claim 10 since Gupta teaches direct communication between the mobile stations within one area (See, for example, paths 130, 115, and 112).

Support for added claim 20 can be found by referring to the specification at page 2, line 32 through page 3, line 2. Claim 20 specifies that the intermediate station is part of the first radio coverage area and the second radio coverage area.

In contrast to claim 20, Gupta teaches that the mobile relay stations are part of either the first coverage area or the second coverage area. This can be clearly seen by referring to Fig. 1 of Gupta, for example.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 10.

Claim 10 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 10.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-20 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Appl. No. 10/590,138
Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2009
Amdt. Dated March 3, 2010

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

March 3, 2010

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101